

REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

I. Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in the present application. By way of this reply, claims 1, 6, 7, 12, and 13 have been amended.

II. Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to the recite that (i) the plurality of client machines are capable of generating at least one print job and (ii) the header analyzer is arranged to selectively convert a language of the print job to a language recognizable by the printer dependent on whether the print job is previously formatted in the language recognizable by the printer. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in lines 6 – 17 on page 5 and Figure 3 of the present application.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the monitoring and repairing comprises (i) determining whether the print job is formatted in a language recognizable by a printer and (ii) if the print job is not formatted in the language recognizable by the printer, selectively converting a language of the print job into the language recognizable by the printer. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in lines 6 – 17 on page 5 and Figure 3 of the

present application.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that (i) the plurality of client machines are capable of generating at least one print job and (ii) the filter is arranged to selectively convert a language of the print job to a language recognizable by the printer dependent on whether the print job is previously formatted in the language recognizable by the printer. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in lines 4 – 24 on page 7 and Figure 5 of the present application.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the filtering comprises (i) determining whether the print job is formatted in a language recognizable by a printer and (ii) if the print job is not formatted in the language recognizable by the printer, selectively converting a language of the print job into the language recognizable by the printer. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in lines 4 – 24 on page 7 and Figure 5 of the present application.

Claim 13 has been amended to the recite that (i) the plurality of client machines are capable of generating at least one print job and (ii) the header analyzer is arranged to selectively convert a language of the print job to a language recognizable by the printer dependent on whether the print job is previously formatted in the language recognizable by the printer. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in lines 6 – 17 on page 5 and Figure 3 of the present application.

III. Objection(s) to the Specification

The title of the present application was objected to as not being descriptive. By way of this reply, the title has been amended to be "Technique for Verifying Print Job Formatting for Network Printing." The amended title is believed to be indicative of the claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the title of the present application is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claim 12 of the present application was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,678,066 issued to Nakamura (hereinafter "Nakamura"). For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a technique for verifying print job formatting in a networked printing system. As discussed in lines 4 – 24 on page 7 of the present, a filter reviews an outgoing print job and, if necessary, converts the format of the print job to a format recognizable by a printer to which the print job is being sent. Accordingly, amended independent claim 12 of the present application requires, in part, that filtering a print job includes (i) determining whether the print job is formatted in a language recognizable by a printer and (ii) if the print job is not formatted in the language recognizable by the printer, selectively converting a language of the print job into the language recognizable by the printer.

Nakamura, in contrast to the present invention, fails to at least disclose the limitations of amended independent claim 12 of the present application discussed above. In the Office Action of March 24, 2004, the print processing section **12** in Figure 2 of

Nakamura is characterized as performing the filtering limitations of claim 12 of the present application. However, now also with reference to Figure 3 of Nakamura, Nakamura explicitly states that the print processing section 12:

. . . sends the headers and the command streams or command groups to the command file section 13 in the following procedure. The print processing section 12 receives a print job, and outputs a job-start escape packet header and a job-start command group (step S101), and then a page-start escape packet header and page-start command group (step S102); it converts one print image into a plurality of command groups (step S103); adds a continuous packet header to each print command stream (Step S104; NO, S105); outputs a pause packet header and a command group when the last command stream of the print image arrives (step S104; YES, S106); returns to the step S103 after the next print image is prepared when the page does not end (step S107; NO, S108); and it outputs a page-end escape header and a page-end command group when the page ends (step S109).

When the job does not yet end, the print processing section 12 prepares the next page, and returns to the process of the step S102 (step S110; NO, step 111). When the job ends, it outputs a job-end escape packet header and a job-end command group, and ends the processing (step S110; YES, S112).

Nakamura, column 6, lines 23 – 47. Nakamura is completely silent as to the print processing section 12 (i) determining whether a print job is formatted in a language recognizable by a printer and (ii) if the print job is not formatted in the language recognizable by the printer, selectively converting a language of the print job into the language recognizable by the printer as required by amended independent claim 12 of the present application. In fact, Nakamura is altogether silent as to *converting a language* of a print job into a *language* recognizable by a printer to which the print job is sent. Accordingly, Nakamura fails to disclose all the limitations of amended independent claim

12 of the present application.

In view of the above, Nakamura fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 12 of the present application. Thus, amended independent claim 12 of the present application is patentable over Nakamura. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-6 and 13-16

Claims 1-6 and 13-16 of the present application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in the Background section of the present application in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,447 issued to Okada et al. (hereinafter "Okada"). For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Like amended independent claim 12 of the present application discussed above, amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 of the present application require, in part, the selective conversion of a language of a print job into a language recognizable by a printer dependent on whether the print job is previously formatted in the language recognizable by the printer.

The Background section of the present application fails to disclose the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 set forth above. Okada also fails to disclose at least these limitations.

The Office Action of March 24, 2004 cites column 5, lines 7 – 14 of Okada as disclosing a print server that checks and judges the contents of a header file of a received

print job. Notwithstanding this purported disclosure, Okada is completely silent as to selectively converting a *language* of a print job into a *language* recognizable by a printer to which the print job is sent as required by amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 of the present application.

In view of the above, Applicant's admitted prior art and Okada, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 of the present application. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 of the present application are patentable over Applicant's admitted prior art and Okada. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-11

Claims 7-11 of the present application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in the Background section of the present application in view of Nakamura. For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, both Applicant's admitted prior art and Nakamura fail to disclose selectively *converting a language* of a print job into a *language* recognizable by a printer to which the print job is sent as required by amended independent claim 7 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant's admitted prior art and Nakamura, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 7 of the present application. Thus, amended independent claim 7 of the present application is patentable over Applicant's admitted

prior art and Nakamura. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places the present application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226.050001;P5180).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/27/01



Jonathan P. Osha, Reg. No. 33,986
OSHA & MAY L.L.P.
1221 McKinney Street, Suite 2800
Houston, TX 77010

Telephone: (713) 228-8600
Facsimile: (713) 228-8778